

So it is very interesting that the people who on the civilian side of the budget say cut, cut, cut, on the defense side say spend, spend, spend. Even if they did not ask for it, spend, spend, spend. It is very hard to listen to those people talk about being serious about the budget. Both sides should be treated the same, and I hope they will.

CONCERNS ABOUT 1997 BUDGET

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, we've now had a look at the Republican's 1997 budget, and I have several major concerns.

It appears that many of the cuts proposed last year have reappeared in the new budget. These include cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, cuts in the earned income tax credit, and in education.

I am greatly concerned about the impact of these cuts on seniors, on rural health programs, on student loan programs.

I also worry about extremist positions on these budget areas which will lead once again to Government shutdowns, disruption of service to Americans, and a tremendous waste of time and money.

Mr. Speaker, we have the means to reach agreement on a plan to balance the budget in 7 years.

In discussions earlier this year, Republicans and the President agreed on certain cuts, enough to realize \$711 billion in savings.

At the time of the discussion, only \$635 billion in cuts was needed to balance the budget by the year 2002. More recent figures show similar areas of agreement.

Let's build on areas where we agree. Let's balance the budget while protecting essential programs for Americans—education, the environment, Medicaid, and Medicare.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 10, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that Jim Dyer, currently the staff director of the Appropriations Committee and formerly a staff assistant for Congressman Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania, has been served with a subpoena issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of United States versus McDade.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compli-

ance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today.

HEALTHY MEALS FOR CHILDREN ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2066) to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide greater flexibility to schools to meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and school breakfast programs, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2066

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Healthy Meals for Children Act".

SEC. 2. INCREASED FLEXIBILITY FOR SCHOOLS TO MEET THE DIETARY GUIDELINES FOR AMERICANS UNDER THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT.

Section 9(f)(2) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(f)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

"(D) USE OF ANY REASONABLE APPROACH.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—A school food service authority may use any reasonable approach, within guidelines established by the Secretary in a timely manner, to meet the requirements of this paragraph, including—

"(I) using the school nutrition meal pattern in effect for the 1994–1995 school year; and

"(II) using any of the approaches described in subparagraph (C).

"(ii) NUTRIENT ANALYSIS.—The Secretary may not require a school to conduct or use a nutrient analysis to meet the requirements of this paragraph."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

□ 1415

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2066 which amends the School Lunch Program to provide schools flexibility in demonstrating how they have met the dietary guidelines for Americans.

This bill not only has bipartisan support in Congress, it has the support of the American School Food Service Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the National School Boards Association, and the Association of School Business Officials.

During the 103d Congress, the National School Lunch Program was modified to require schools to meet the dietary guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and breakfast programs. I supported this change.

The law permitted schools to use nutrient-based menu planning, assisted nutrient-based menu planning or a food-based menu system, which was the only method of menu planning used under prior law, as long as they met the dietary guidelines. On Tuesday, June 13, 1995, the Department of Agriculture published their final regulations on the school meal initiatives for healthy Americans. Unfortunately, these regulations did not meet congressional intent with respect to providing schools with flexibility in how they demonstrated they were in compliance with the dietary guidelines.

Schools throughout the Nation expressed concern about the implementation of these final regulations. Of special concern were changes to the food-based menu system which had the potential of adding from 5 to 10 cents to the cost of school meals. The reason for the increased cost was a requirement that schools add additional servings of grains, bread, and fruits and vegetables to school meals. Even schools currently meeting the dietary guidelines under the previous food-based menu plan would have to enact such changes. The alternative would be to use the nutrient standard menu plan, which would require schools to make a significant investment in computer hardware and require extensive training and technical assistance to implement the new software and procedures associated with this plan.

On July 1995, I introduced H.R. 2066 with my colleague on the committee, GEORGE MILLER. H.R. 2066 will not change, in any way, the requirement that school meals meet the dietary guidelines for Americans. It will, however, permit schools to use any reasonable approach to meet the dietary guidelines, including those contained in the regulations issued by the Department. Adding additional fruits, vegetables, and grains is certainly one way to ensure the dietary guidelines are met. However, schools could choose to bake instead of fry certain food items or use low-fat alternatives to some food items. There are not just one or two ways to meet the dietary guidelines.

Nothing in this act affects the ability of States to determine if schools have met the dietary guidelines. Compliance reviews will continue to take place. There will still be State and Federal audits and corrective action will still be required for schools not meeting the dietary guidelines.